THE HOLY QUR'AN
What Shias Say

ABDILAHI NASSIR

CONTENTS

HIS ARGUMENTS

On why it is impossible to have unity and understanding between Sunnis and Shias, Sheikh M. al-Khatib gave the following eight reasons:

1. Shias have a different Qur'an from that of the Sunnis.
2. The sources relied upon by Shias in understanding Prophet's Traditions (*ahadith*) are not the same as those of the Sunnis.
3. Shias do not respect the Companions of Prophet Muhammad s.a.w.w.; on the contrary they in fact insult and curse them!
4. Shias believe in *taqiyya*, by which they appear to Sunnis "contrary to what they conceal". Therefore one is not in a position to know the truth about them.
5. Shias do not recognize the first three Caliphs accepted by Sunnis. They only recognize their twelve Imams.
6. On the Uniqueness and Omniscience of Allah, and on whether He can be seen or not, Shias believe differently from the Sunnis.
7. Shias' principles of religion and jurisprudence are different from Sunnis'.
8. Contrary to the Sunnis, Shias believe in *raj'ah* – which means that, while approaching the end of this

world, the Mahdi (a.s.) will come and "slaughter all his political opponents" and will consequently restore to the Shias all their rights which were denied them previously by the followers of other sects (*madhaahib*).

The above were the reasons which prompted Sheikh M. al-Khatib to write his book. His objective was to warn the Sunnis of the impending danger of answering to any call meant to bring about unity and understanding between them and their Shia brothers and sisters. One could safely conclude that his followers too were driven by the same reasons to have his book translated into Kiswahili and English.

Apart from the main points mentioned above, there are other less serious accusations which were repeated here and there in his book. It is my intention, *inshaa Allah*, to deal with them as well in the best of my ability.

In replying to these arguments, I shall try to show that:

(i) some of Sheikh M. al-Khatib's statements go against the very tenets of Shiism;
(ii) whatever religious belief the Shias hold is based on the Qur'an and the Sunnah of Prophet Muhammad s.a.w.w.;
(iii) almost all of Sheikh M. al-Khatib's accusations against the Shias could also be made against the Sunnis, based on what is contained in the books relied upon by the latter; and therefore

(iv) the differences between Sunnis and Shias are not that great as to prevent unity and understanding between the two.

And Allah is the One to be asked for assistance.

O Allah! May You show us the Truth so that we recognize it to be so, and help us to abide by it. And may You show us the untruth so that we recognize it to be so, and help us to avoid it.

WHO IS A SUNNI?

Sheikh M. al-Khatib's objective in writing his book was to warn Sunnis against the dangers of Shiism. I therefore thought that it would be better if a Sunni knew himself or herself first before talking about Shias because, as it has so far transpired, either many Sunnis do not know who they are or, if they do, do so erroneously. For example, some of the learned Sunnis are of the opinion that they have been called so because of the fact that they are the only ones who abide by the *sunna* of Prophet Muhammad (s.a.w.w.) – as if other Muslim *madhaahib*, like the Shia Ithnaashari, Zaydis or Ibadhis, do not do so. Others think that it has been so because Sunnism had been in existence from the time of Prophet Muhammad. However, on both beliefs the contrary is the case.

In actual fact a Sunni is one who, when it comes to matters of Islamic jurisprudence, follows the opinion of one of the four imams (Abu Hanifa, Malik, Shafi or Hanbal) or their students; and in matters of *aqida* follows the views of Abul Hassan al-Ash'ari. In other words, if one follows the views of others than the above mentioned in those two areas, then one is not regarded to be a Sunni.

In order for one to understand exactly when Sunnism started, it is important to know, at least in brief, the history of those imams:

Imam Abu Hanifa was born in Kufa in the year 80H, and died in Baghdad in 150H. Among his teachers was Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq a.s. (who was the sixth Imam of the Shia Ithnaashari). Abu Hanifa is quoted to have said that had it not been for the two years he was the student of Imam Ja'far, he (Abu Hanifa) would have perished *(lahalaka)*.

Imam Malik was born in Madina in 93H, and died there in 179H. He, as well, had Imam Ja'far among his teachers.

Imam Shafi was born in Gaza in 150H, and died in Egypt in 204H.

Imam Hanbal was born in Baghdad in 164H, where he died in 241H.

The last, Abul Hassan al-Ash'ari, was born in Basra in 260H, and died in Baghdad in 333H.

What the above dates testify to is that the first of them, Abu Hanifa, was born about seventy years *after* the death of Prophet Muhammad s.a.w.w. who died in 10H. Therefore the question which arises here is: Between the death of Prophet Muhammad s.a.w.w. and Abu Hanifa becoming an Imam, who did the Muslims, living during that period of more than seventy years, follow? Weren't they Muslims? Or what about those who taught Abu Hanifa; didn't they have followers of their own? If they did, where did those followers disappear to? Is it conceivable that one who follows the views of a teacher cannot be accepted as a Muslim, but he who follows the views of that teacher's student can? If the answer is in the negative, on what grounds is it so? If it is in the positive, then why are the

ordinary Sunnis made to believe that they are the only genuine Muslims?

To answer the above questions in a detailed manner, a separate book will be needed as there is a lot to be said on this matter. Meanwhile, what I would like you to do, dear reader, is to ask yourself these questions – or ask whomsoever you think knows better than you do – and then ponder over the answers given; because it is only after getting the right answers to them that you will be in a better position to understand this riddle which has caused the friction and misunderstanding between Muslims.

As regards the question of *aqida*, we have seen that Sunnis follow the opinion of Abul Hassan al-Ash'ari (260H - 333H) who, as we can see, was born nineteen years after the death of the last Sunni imam, i.e. Imam Hanbal (164H - 241H). Therefore al-Ash'ari never met any of the Sunni imams. That being the case, which *aqida* did the four imams follow during their lifetime? Was it the one based on the views of al-Ash'ari (who had not been born yet), or a different one which existed before al-Ash'ari's birth? If it was the latter, which one was that? And were those imams still Muslims despite doing so? If they were – and I don't think that there is anyone who can dare say that they were not – why should this apply only to them? Why should somebody else be regarded as a non-Muslim just because one follows a different *aqida* from that of al-Ash'ari? Definitely al-Ash'ari was not born with his views. Before forming his own, did he not follow the views of the experts who were in existence in those times? If he did so – and the truth is that he did – was he then not a Muslim? If he was, despite following the views which were not his own, why

should one be regarded today as a non-Muslim by doing exactly the same?

These are among the questions which I would like you to ask yourself (or whomsoever is more knowledgeable) and consider the answers very carefully. For the correct answers are the ones that will help you to understand the source of the controversy we are discussing in this series.

It is my hope, *inshaa Allah*, that the brief explanation given above, and the correct answers one will get to the few questions we have posed, will enable a Sunni to understand who he or she is. And it is from Allah that we should seek help.

THE HOLY QUR'AN

Allah (s.w.t.) has said:

(i) Verily We are the Ones who revealed (this) Reminder, and verily We are the Ones who will protect it. (Chapter 15:9)

(ii) … And verily it is a Book Unassailable. Falsehood shall not come from before it nor from behind it: a revelation from the All-Wise, the Most Praised One. (Chapter 41:41-42)

Those are Allah's words which prove that the Qur'an is a book which is protected against any additions, omissions or alterations. All Muslims – of all times and all countries – believe that the Qur'an which we have in this age is the same one as that which existed during the time of Prophet Muhammad s.a.w.w., and that it will remain so till the Final Day (*Qiyamah*). Therefore, whoever believes otherwise is not a Muslim.

As Sheikh M. al-Khatib alleges in his book (page 4) that Shias do not believe so, I have thought it better to begin my reply by quoting various Shia scholars who lived during different periods. These quotations, as we shall see, will prove Sheikh al-Khatib wrong. Thereafter, I will deal with his other allegations.

1. ***Al-Fadhl bin Shaadhaan:*** He was among the great Shia scholars who lived in the third century of Hijra. In refuting the opinions of Sunni scholars of his time that the Qur'an had been distorted, al-Fadhl said in his book *al-Iidhaah*.

> And for those who, by quoting such Traditions think that the Qur'anic text *(nass)* has been corrupted, they are definitely making a mistake.

2. ***Abu Ja'far Muhammad bin 'Ali bin Baabawayh al-Qummi:*** This scholar is better known as al-Shaykh al-Saduq; he died in 381H. In his book entitled *al-I'tiqaadaat* he said:

> Our belief is that the Qur'an which Allah s.w.t. revealed to His Messenger, Prophet Muhammad s.a.w.w, is the same as the one which is between the two covers and which is in the hands of the people; no more than that…. And whoever charges us with believing in excess, has lied.

3. ***Sayyid al-Murtadhaa 'Ali bin al-Husayn al-Muusawi al-Alawi:*** This is another great Shia scholar, who died in 436H. In reply to the questions of *Taraabulusiyyaat,* he said:

> Knowledge and certainty on the validity of the narration of the Holy Qur'an are like the knowledge and certainty on the existence of countries, cities, famous historical events, popular books, and the poems compiled by the Arabs. This is because the specific regard and attention, and the strong motive for the narration of the text of the Holy Qur'an and

its upkeeping, had been much stronger than precision and attention given to the above-cited items…

During the time of the Messenger of Allah s.a.w.w., the Holy Qur'an had been a compiled collection exactly as it is now. The Holy Prophet s.a.w.w. had even charged a group of his Companions with the responsibility of memorizing and safeguarding the Holy Qur'an. At that time, it was customary for the people to recite the Holy Qur'an before the Holy Prophet s.a.w.w. to ensure the accuracy of the text. The Holy Prophet s.a.w.w., too, listened to their recitation. A group of the Companions, such as Abdullah bin Mas'ud, Ubayy bin Ka'b, and others read the whole text of the Holy Qur'an several times in the presence of the Holy Prophet s.a.w.w.
With a little attention, one comes to realize that all these matters indicate that the Holy Qur'an has been a compiled collection. No one takes into account the opponents of this belief, be they from *Imamiyya* (Shia Ithnaashariyya) or *Hashwiyyah* (non-Shias), for their view is derived from a group of *Akhbariyyun* (or *Ashab al-Hadith* i.e. followers of the Traditions) who had narrated weak *ahadith* on the subject, thinking that they had related reliable and valid *ahadith*, whereas such weak *ahadith* have no power to challenge something based on definitive knowledge and certainty.

(*Majma'ul Bayaan*, Volume One, page 15)

4. ***Shaykh at-Taifah Abu Ja'far Muhammad bin al-Hassan at-Tusi*** (died in 461H): In *Tafsirus-Swaafi*, Volume One, pages 48-49, he wrote:

> The remarks about addition and loss in the Qur'anic text are not worthy of the respect the Holy Qur'an possesses as (meaning that the text of the Holy Qur'an is today more than what it was before) there is a consensus among the *ulamaa* regarding the invalidity of this matter.
>
> Regarding the deficiency of the Holy Qur'an (meaning that some parts of the Qur'anic text have been deleted), apparently the consensus of the Muslim sects also proves the contrary. The same holds true in our school of faith. This is exactly the belief that has been confirmed and proven by al-Sayyid al-Murtadhaa (may Allah be pleased with him). This belief has been clearly expressed in the narrations and Traditions.
>
> However, there are a number of Traditions from the Shia and Sunnis concerning the deficiency of many verses of the Holy Qur'an and regarding the interchange of some of the verses. All these Traditions are *akhbar al-aahaad*, i.e. Traditions which are not *mutawaatir* and cannot cause certainty. Thus, one should turn away and keep away from these sorts of *ahadith* and should not engage oneself in them. Moreover, these Traditions are paraphrasable. Had these Traditions been correct, they would not have marred the Holy Qur'an which is presently available between the

two covers, because knowledge and certainty prove the validity of this Qur'an, and no one from among the Islamic *Ummah* has any objection to or complaint against it, nor does anyone reject it.

5. *Shaykh Abu 'Ali at-Tabarsi:* He died in 548H. In the first volume of his translation of the Qur'an, entitled *Majma'ul Bayaan*, page 15, he states:

> There is a consensus and unanimity among Muslims that there is not any "addition" in the Holy Qur'an. But with regard to the omission of the text of the Holy Qur'an, a group of *Imamiyya* and a group of *Hashwiyyah* who are Sunnis have said that there are alterations and omissions in the Holy Qur'an, but the belief accepted by the *Imamiyya* holds otherwise.

6. *Sayyid Ibn Twaawus* (died in 664H) states in his book, *Sa'dus Su'ud*, pages 144-145 and 192-193:

The *Imamiyya's* view is that the Qur'an was not corrupted.

Then, in responding to the Sunnis, he continues to state:

> I am surprised by those who, while believing that the Holy Qur'an has been preserved by the Messenger of Allah s.a.w.w., and has been compiled by the Prophet s.a.w.w himself, have in the same breath narrated the differences of the people of Makka and Madina, and those of Kufa and Basra. They have also believed that *Bismillaahir Rahmaanir Rahim* (i.e. in the name of

> Allah, the Beneficent, the Merciful) is not an integral part of the *suras* (chapters) of the Holy Qur'an. It is more surprising that they have reasoned that if *Bismillaah*… (In the name of Allah….) had been an integral part of the *sura*, then it could have been preceded by something else also. What a surprise! When it is believed that the Holy Qur'an is immune from and guarded against any addition and omission, and when such a belief is supported by man's wisdom and by religion, how could it be said that what had been revealed before the *suras* has not been included as a part of the Holy Qur'an? Is such a thing possible?

Since it is not our intention to dwell on this issue at length in this rejoinder (although we would be prepared to do so if necessary), there is no need to continue quoting yet more Shia scholars on it. We think that what we have so far cited should suffice for the time being. But for the benefit of our readers, we hereunder list the names of only some of the Shia scholars who said that the Qur'an which was in existence during the lifetime of Prophet Muhammad s.a.w.w. is exactly the same one which is with the contemporary Muslims – no more no less.

1. Mulla Fat-hullah al-Kashani (died in 877H), in his translation, *Manhajus Sadiqin*.
2. Al-Muhaqqiq Zaynuddin al-Bayadhi (died in 877H), in his book, *as-Swiratum Mustaqim*.
3. Muhammad Bahauddin al-Amili, better known as al-Shaykh al-Bahai, (died 1031H), as quoted in the translation of the Qur'an, *Aalair Rahman*.

4. Mullah Muhsin, better known as al-Faydhul Kashani (died in 1091H), in his translation of the Qur'an, *Tafsirus Swafi*.
5. Muhammad bin al-Hasan al-Hurrul Amili (died in 1104H) in his treatise in Farsi language, *Risala Fi Ithbati Adamit Tahrif*.
6. Al-Qadhi Sayyid Nurullah as-Shustari (died in 1091H), as quoted in *Aalair Rahman*.
7. Sayyid Muhammad Mahdi bin Sayyid Murtadha at-Tabatabai, known as Bahrul Ulum (died in 1212H), in his book, *Fawaidul Usul*.
8. Shaykh Ja'far bin Shaykh Khidhr aj-Janahi an-Najafi, known as Kashiful Ghitaa (died in 1228), in his book, *Kashful Ghitaa an Mubhamaatis Shariatil Gharaa.*
9. Shaykh Muhammad Hassan bin al-Mawla Abdullah al-Mamaqani (died in 1323H), in his book, *Tanqihul Maqal*.
10. Shaykh Muhammad Jawad al-Balaghi (died in 1352H), in his translation, *Aaalair Rahman*.
11. Ayatullah Sayyid Husayn Kuhkamari (died in 1299H), as explained by his student in *Bushral Wusul Ila Ilmil Usul*.
12. Mirza Hasan al-'Ashtiyani (died in 1319H), in his book, *Bahrul Fawaid.*
13. Sayyid Abdul Husayn Sharafuddin al-Musawi al-Amili (died in 1377H), in his book, *Ajwibatu Masaili Musa Jarullah*.
14. Ayatullahil-Udhmaa Sayyid Abul Qasim al-Khui (died in 1413H), in his translation, *al-Bayan*.
15. Al-Imamul Khumayni (died in 1409H), in his book, *Kashful Asrar*.
16. Shaykh Muhammad an-Nahawandi, in his book, *Nafahatur Rahman*.

17. Sayyid ‘Ali Naqi al-Hindi, in his book, *Tafsirul Qur’an*.

The above, therefore, are the views of some of the prominent Shia scholars – from the third to the twentieth century! Reading them, one would clearly see that the Shias’ belief on the Qur’an is the same as that of all other Muslims; that is, since it was first revealed to date, not even a dot has changed. But, for reasons known to himself, Sheikh M. al-Khatib decided not to inform the Muslims about these views. Instead, he preferred to tell them that:

(i) the Shia religion is based on the “misinterpretation” *(taawil)* of the Qur’an and giving it “a meaning other than that which was understood by the noble Companions who received it directly from the Prophet, and other than that which was understood by the *Imams* of Islam who received it from the very generation amongst whom the Qur’an descended by way of the Divine Revelation”! (see p.4 of the English translation of his book).

(ii) “there have been both additions to it and omissions from it,” and that the evidence of this is in the book called *Fasl ul-Khitab fi Ithbati Tahrifi Kitabi Rabbii Arbaab*, written by Mirza Husayn at Twabarsy (p.4).

(iii) among the proofs that something is missing in the Qur’an is the S*urat al Wilaya* which, according to him, Shias claim that it has been omitted from the copies of the Qur’an (*maswhaf*) in our possession: and that the mentioned *sura* has been “affirmed” in at Twabarsy’s book which we have cited in (ii) above.

(iv) that *sura* is also in their book *(Dabistan Madhaahib)*, written in Farsi by Muhsin Faniy al-Kashmiri (p.7).

(v) just as he mentioned *Surat al-Wilaya* to prove that changes have been made to the Qur'an, at-Twabarsy similarly quoted what is "on page 289 of *Al-Kafi*, 1278H edition, (published in) Iran" to prove his point. He continues to claim that, to the Shias, *Al-Kafi* "is what *Sahih Bukhari* is to the Sunni Muslims" (page 7).

(vi) among the verses which Shias claim to have been removed from the Qur'an is that one which says: *Waja'alnaa 'Aliyyan swihraka*, meaning: "And we made 'Ali your son-in-law." (page 8).

(vii) Shias have a *Maswhaf of Fatima* whose contents are "three times as much as this Qur'an of yours. By Allah, it does not contain one single letter of your Qur'an"! (page 10).

Let us, therefore, take a look at and respond to the above allegations:

"Misinterpreting" Verses

This is Sheikh M. al-Khatib's first allegation: that when the Shias translate the Holy Qur'an, they misinterpret it and give it "a meaning other than that which was understood by the noble Companions who received it directly from the Prophet, and the other than that which was understood by the Imams of Islam who received it from the very generation amongst whom the Qur'an descended by way of Divine Revelation."

It is surprising that Sheikh M. al-Khatib did not give us an example of at least few verses which were thus affected. Perhaps those who are still alive, and who continue with his work, will do us that favour when they decide to reply to this book. At the moment, I would like our readers to understand that, as is the case with the translations of the Qur'an by Muslims of other *madhaahib*, some of the translations by the Shias contain authentic as well as unauthentic transmissions. When reading the books written by Shia interpreters of the Qur'an and scholars of Hadith, one will see how these experts analyse them – by either accepting or rejecting such transmissions. And the same is the case with the Sunnis.

But if Sheikh M. al-Khatib insists that all Shias must be in the wrong for the simple reason that *some* of their scholars have "misinterpreted" some of the verses – irrespective of the fact that such misinterpretations *(taawil)* are not accepted by all the Shias – what should Shias say about similar action by the Sunnis? Does it mean that Sheikh M. al-Khatib, and others of the same opinion as his, are not aware of the misinterpretations (*ta'wil)* in the Sunni books on the translation of the Qur'an – such as *ad-Durrul Manthur* by Suyuti, *Gharaibul Qur'an* by an-Nishaburi, *Tafsirul Qur'anil Adhim* by Tustari, *Araisul Bayan* by Shirazi, *Tafsir* by Ibn Arabi, and others? Or does he dispute that all the scholars mentioned here are Sunni, and not Shia?

Therefore, my fellow Muslim, this issue about the *ta'awil* of the verses should not be an excuse for stopping Shia and Sunni coming closer to each other and cooperate in the

interests of Islam. For what is alleged against the Shia, could as well be alleged against the Sunni.

Faslul Khitab

Sheikh M. al-Khatib's second allegation concerns the book called *Faslul Khitab Fi Ithbati Tahrifi Kitabi Rabbil Arbab*, by Mirza Husein at-Twabarsy.

On page 4 of his book, Sheikh M. al-Khatib states that in *Faslul Khitab* there is evidence that, according to Shia belief, there are "both additions to and omissions from" the Qur'an . On this claim please turn to page 9-13 of this book to see how several Shia *ulamaa* have rejected that theory. Please turn also to pages 31-39 of this book to see that Sunnis subscribe to this belief as well – and this can be seen in their main books which are relied upon as "the most authentic after the Qur'an"! If that is the case, why should it be blamed on Shias alone?

It is true, as Sheikh M. al-Khatib has stated, that the book in question was published in Iran in 1298H. But it is not true that it contains the evidence by "Shiite scholars in different eras"! The truth is that the mentioned book includes evidences from the Sunnis as well – and the latter in a bigger quantity!

However, what is important here is to know that, after the publication of that book, some of the Shia scholars wrote other books as rejoinders to it. Scholars such as Sayyid Muhammad Hussein Shahristani in his book, *Risaalatu Hifdhil Kitabis Sharifi An Shubhatil Qawli Bit Tahrif*, and Sheikh Mahmud at-Tahrani in his book, *Kashful Irtiyabi*. Wasn't Sheikh M. al-Khatib aware of this?

It should also be understood that before his death, the author of *Faslul Khitab* admitted that it was a mistake to have given his book that title. He said that it would have been better to have called it *Faslul Khitab Fi Adami Tahrifil Kitab*, because in it he proved that all the chapters and verses of the Holy Qur'an, which is available in the four corners of the world, "were a revelation from Allah, which were tampered with neither by alterations and changes nor by additions or omissions – since (the day) it was bound together to this day…"

But even if we are to accept that all that is contained in *Faslul Khitab* is from Shia transmissions, and even if we do not accept Sheikh at-Twabarsy's report that he admitted to his mistake, what will Sheikh M. al-Khatib tell us concerning those transmissions which are contained in Volume Two of *al-Itqaan* by Suyuti, and which are similar to the ones in *Faslul Khitab*? Because of that, is he or others who have similar views as his, prepared to judge the Sunnis in the same manner as he did the Shias? If not, then our readers will definitely want to know why.

Surat al-Wilaya

This is the chapter which the opponents of Shiism make so much capital of. According to Sheikh M. Khatib (p.5), this chapter has been mentioned on page 180 of *Faslul Khitab*. He also mentions that one "trustworthy scholar" by the name of Muhammad 'Ali Sa'oodi who was a "chief consultant" to the Egyptian Ministry of Justice, examined "an Iranian manuscript copy" owned by one Mr. Brown, an orientalist, and photocopied it.

This is what we have been told by the Sheikh.

What is astonishing, though, is that whoever provides an "evidence" in support of this claim produces the very same copy (of the *maswhaf*) which Ustadh Muhammad 'Ali Sa'oodi got from Mr. Brown! Why is it so? Does it mean that no other copy of such a *maswhaf* exists except that of Mr. Brown? How was it possible for Mr. Brown to have laid his hand on it while Sheikh M. al-Khatib and his associates failed to do so? Furthermore, why would Shias conceal that particular chapter (if, that is, they believe that it is an authentic one from the Qur'an) when it is about the sovereignty *(wilaya)* of Imam 'Ali – which is one of the main pillars of the Shia faith? Why would Shias do so with this particular chapter when they do cite various Qur'anic verses to prove the *wilaya* of Imam 'Ali? Moreover, how come that when we go through all the translations of the Qur'an written by Shia scholars, and in different languages, we never come across such a chapter? These are pertinent questions which you, the reader, should ask yourself lest you are taken in by such fabrications.

The very fact that such a copy was obtained from someone who is an orientalist should be reason enough to make any sincere Muslim who seriously cares about his or her religion to outrightly reject such a lie, for the simple reason that orientalists are known to be great enemies of Islam. They are the ones, together with the Jews, who introduced in institutions of higher learning this field of study known as *Orientalism* with the sole objective of weakening and ultimately destroying the unity among Muslims; to pave the way for colonial rule in, and exploitation of, Muslim countries; as well as attack Muslims for having opposed

Christianity during the Middle Ages. In order to realize their objectives, they founded a number of colleges, launched several journals, held numerous conferences, and published many books which disparaged the Holy Qur'an and Prophet Muhammad (s.a.w.w.) in particular, as well as Islam in general; and they did all this in a very subtle way.

How, then, could Sheikh M. al-Khatib be satisfied and rely on the "evidence" of a single copy of such a *maswhaf*, which was obtained from such people? Or why did he attach so much importance on the issue of that chapter alone and elect not to remember what is contained in books authored by Sunni scholars regarding other chapters with more missing verses than those seven of the *Surat al-Wilaya*? Below we give only three examples; the rest are on pages 31-38 of this book:

(i) On page 152 of Volume Seven of *Majma'uz Zawaid* it is written "that Abdulrahman bin Yazid, that is an-Nakhai, said that Abdullah used to erase the *muawidhataini* from his copies of *maswhaf*, and that he used to say that they *were not from the Book of Allah* (s.w.t). It continues: "It has been narrated by Abdullah bin Ahmad and Tabrani. And the people of Abdullah are upright, and the people of Tabrani are trustworthy."

Therefore, according to the above Hadith, those two chapters (113 and 114) which are contained in the copies of the *maswhaf* we currently use, are additions. If that is the case, wouldn't the Shia, then, be justified to accuse their Sunni brothers and sisters that their Qur'an contains additions?

(ii) in *al-Itqaan* of Imam Suyuti (Volume One, page 87), it is written that in the *maswhaf* of Ibn Abbas and Ubay bin Ka'b were two chapters, *Al-Khala*' and *Al-Hafd*, which read:

اللّهم إنّا نستعينك و نستغفرك و نثني عليك و لا نكفرك و نخلع و نترك من يفجرك اللهم إياك نعبد و لك نصلّي و نسجد و إليك نسعى و نحفد نرجو رحمتك و نخشي عذابك ان عذابك بالكافرين ملحق

When one refers to the entire *maswhaf*, does one come across any chapters with such names? The obvious answer is No! Are there such verses in the Qur'an? The answer is equally in the negative. If, then, according to what is contained in Imam Suyuti's *al-Itqaan*, someone were to say that the Qur'an is short of two chapters, would that person be wrong in saying so? What, therefore, would Sheikh M. al-Khatib say concerning those two chapters in comparison to that single one of *al-Wilaya*?

(iii) in *Sahih Muslim* (see Volume 2, pages 500-501, Hadith No. 2286 of the English edition, we are told that Abu Musa al-Ash'ari said that they used to recite a *sura* whose length was somewhat equal to the one of *Sura Bara'ah*, but he had forgotten it except one verse only, which reads:

لو كان لإبن آدم و اديان من مال لابتغى واديا ثالثاً و لا يملأ جوف ابن آدم الا التّراب

He also said that they used to recite a chapter which they used to compare with one of the *musabbihaat* (that is those chapters which start with either the word *sabbaha* or

yusabbihu), but he had forgotten it except one verse, which he still remembered:

يآ ايها الذين آمنوا لم تقولون ما لا تفعلون , فتكتب شهادة في أعناقكم فتسئلون عنها يوم القيامة

My dear brother and sister! Please be reminded that *Sura Bara'ah* is the ninth chapter, which is in the tenth part *(juz'u)*, of the Holy Qur'an; it is also called *Sura at-Tawbah*. The *sura* in question has 129 verses. Therefore, according to the Hadith mentioned above, the Qur'an which is with us today is short of one chapter which contains 129 verses; because even if you look for that verse which Abu Musa al-Ash'ari could remember, you will never find it in the existing copies of the Holy Qur'an. Would Sheikh M. al-Khatib still want to blame the Shias for being short of seven verses of *al-Wilaya*, and that the Shias should not do the same to Sheikh M. al-Khatib and his ilk for having a shortage of 129 verses?

When we look at the *musabbihaat*, we will find that they are a total of six chapters: 57, 59,61, 62,64 and 87. The shortest among them (62), *Sura al-Jumu'a,* comprises of eleven verses. Looking at it, as well as the rest of them, one does not find the verse which Abu Musa al-Ash'ari used to remember, except the first bit only, which is the second verse of the 61st chapter (Sura as-swaff).

Having seen all this, what would those who volunteered to assist Sheikh M. al-Khatib in translating and distributing his book, say? Would they still expect us to believe that it is only the Shias who claim that the Qur'an is not complete?

Lastly, Sheikh M. al-Khatib said (p.5) that Sheikh at-Twabarsy copied the *Sura al-Wilaya* on page 180 of his book, *Faslul Khitab*. But Sheikh Lutful-Lahi as-Swafi has contradicted this on page 62 of his *Ma'al Khatib Fi Khututihil Aridhwa*. As-Swafi says: "There isn't in *Faslul Khitab* – neither on page 180 nor anywhere else –from the beginning to the end of the book, where that fabricated *sura* (i.e. *Sura al-Wilaya*) is mentioned!"

Dabistan Madhhab

Sheikh M. al-Khatib's fourth claim (p.6) is that *Surat al-Wilaya* is also contained in a Shia book called *Dabistan Madhhab*, written in Farsi by Muhsin Fani al-Kashmiri, and "printed in Iran several times". Our response to this is: (i) that it is not a Shia book; (ii) there is no certainty that its author is the one mentioned by Sheikh M. al-Khatib; (iii) it is not true that it was printed in Iran several times; and, most importantly, (iv) in it *Surat al-Wilaya* is not mentioned at all! This is what Sheikh Lutful-Lahi as-Swafi, who did research on that claim and who understands the Farsi language well, says in his book, *Ma'al Khatib Fi Khututihil Aridhwa* (pp. 64-66). Below we just summarise the contents of those pages:

The book in question has nothing to do with Shiism, but deals with various customs and traditions – authentic and false. It is full of stories which cannot be believed to be true by any sound-minded person, and many of those stories are credited to people who are unknown, although their names suggest that they were Hindu dervishes.

The book does not carry the name of the author nor his *madhhab*. In fact there are disagreements as to who its

actual author is. Some say it is Muhammad Fan, while others mention the name of Mobed Shah. Yet others say it is Mobed Afraseyab, while the rest say it is Kykhosro Ibn Azar Kywan. In short, it is not certain that Muhsin Fani al-Kashmiri is the one who wrote it.

As regards the claim that it was "printed in Iran several times", Sheikh Lutful-Lahi as-Swafi says (p.66) that after searching so hard for it in all major libraries he managed to find only three copies: the first edition, published in Bombay in 1262; the second edition, published in 1268, but with no mention of where it was published; and the third edition, also published in Bombay, in 1277. Are these "several times"? And is Bombay in Iran?

Al-Kafi is not al-Bukhari

Sheikh M. al-Khatib's fifth claim (p.6) is that at-Twabarsy has produced an evidence to the effect that changes have been made to the Qur'an "according to what is contained on page 289 of the book of *(al-Kaafi)*…" and that to Shias this book "is what *al-Bukhari* is to Muslims"! As if Shias are not Muslims!!

In order to adequately respond to this claim, let us see what Shias themselves say on *al-Kafi*, and then compare that to what Sunnis say on *al-Bukhari*.

On pages 132 and 134 of his book, *Diraasaatun Fil Hadith Walmuhaddithiyn*, Sayyid Hashim Ma'ruf al-Hasani said that there was no consensus among the earlier scholars as to the reliability of all of al-Kafi's narrations in their generalities as well as in their details. He went on to say: "In the *ahadith* contained in *al-Kafi*, whose total is 16199,

only 5072 are authentic (*sahih*), 44 are *hasan*, 1128 are *muwath-thaq*, 302 are *qawiyy* (strong) and 9553 are *dhaif* (weak)."

According to the above, therefore, it will be seen that more than 50% of the *ahadith* in *al-Kafi* are *not sahih*! This is what Shias say on their own book.

Let us now see how Sunnis regard theirs, *al-Bukhari*. Imam Dhahabi once said that "after the Book of Allah s.w.t. *al-Bukhari* is the best among all other Islamic books." And several prominent scholars of Hadith concur that Imam Bukhari said: "I have compiled (this book of mine) that it should be an argument/ evidence between Allah s.w.t. and me. I have not included in it except those *ahadith* which are *sahih.* And I have left out many more which are *sahih* so that the book may not become hefty (see page 379 of *al-Hadith Wal Muhaddithuun*, by Muhammad Abu Zahw).

Moreover, in February 1966, *Majallatul Arabiy*, a journal published in Kuwait had, in its issue No. 87, an article written by Abdul Warith Kabir titled, *"Not Everything in Sahih Bukhari is authentic, But Therein are Also the Fabricated and the Munkar."* This article angered many Sunni scholars, among them Sheikh Muhammad Abu Zahra and Sheikh Yusuf al-Qardhawi. In addition, about 31 lecturers at the Damascus University wrote a strong petition to the Emir of Kuwait opposing it, and also asked him to use his powers to stop publication of such articles. On the other hand, a Kuwaiti organization called *Jumuiyyatul Islahil Ijtimaiy* put together a number of articles in defence of Bukhari. These were subsequently published in a book called *Kullu Maa Fil Bukhari Sahih* (Everything contained

in *al-Bukhari* is authentic). Therefore, up to the present century, Sunnis still believe that each and everything in *al-Bukhari* is authentic.

If, as we have so far seen, Shias believe that more than 50% of the *ahadith* in *al-Kafi* are **not sahih**; and if Sunnis believe that all the *ahadith* contained in *al-Bukhari* **are sahih**, how, then, could the two books be in the same league? On what grounds? Perhaps those who share the views of Sheikh M. al-Khatib would try to explain to us.

After this brief explanation, it will be clearly seen that the evidence which Sheikh M. al-Khatib said is on page 289 of *al-Kafi* would be about those *ahadith* which are *not sahih*. And that had already been said by Shia scholars of Hadith in their various books; for example, *Rijaalun Najjaashi, Qaamusur Rijaal, Mu'jam Rijaal al-Hadith; Khulaasatur Rijaal*; and *Diraasaatun Fil Hadith Wal Muhaddithiyn.*

The above, therefore, is our brief response on *al-Kafi* and its contents.

Waja'alnaa 'Aliyyan Swihraka

The premise of Sheikh M. al-Khatib's sixth claim is that the above quoted words are of a verse which used to be in the Qur'an which Shias now claim to have been omitted!

After understanding Shias' position on the Qur'an (that it is the same as the one revealed to Prophet Muhammad s.a.w.w.) and the views of their scholars of Hadith on those *ahadith* which mention the omissions from or additions to the Qur'an (**being not sahih**), it follows therefore that the above mentioned "Qur'anic verse" falls into that category

of unauthentic *ahadith*. However, such *ahadith* are found not only in Shia books, but in Sunni ones as well! For example, referring to *Sahih al-Bukhari*: (Volume 6, p.467, Hadith No, 405) one would see it mentioned therein that Ibn Abbas said that: “When *Waandhir ashiyratakal-aqrabiyn* was revealed, it was followed by *warahtwaka minhumul mukhlaswin*.

What more should we say after seeing how the infallibility of *al-Bukhari* has been so vigorously defended (see page 26)? For instance, is the end-bit which reads, *warahtwaka minhumul mukhlaswin* included in the Qur’an which is in our hands today? If you have a look at Sura 26:214 you will only find the first part of that verse! Where would the second part of it have disappeared to?

However, it is sad to note that although the mentioned Hadith has been included in the English version of *al-Bukhari* as we have quoted here in Arabic, but the contentious part *warahtwaka minhumul mukhlaswin* was not translated in English! Therefore, those who understand English but not Arabic will not realize that that particular part has been left out! The question which one is bound to ask is: Was the translation of that part of the Hadith omitted by mistake or by design?

The *Maswhaf* of Fatimah

The seventh claim of Sheikh M. Al-Khatib is that Shias have a *maswhaf* which is called *The Maswhaf of Fatimah*, and which is different from the *masahif* which Muslims have.

It is correct for one to say that there exists a *maswhaf* by that name. But the word *maswhaf* does not mean the *Qur'an*; for it is explicitly mentioned in the *ahadith* that are in *al-Kafi*, which is quoted by Sheikh M. al-Katib (see pages 237-242 of the First Volume), that there is nothing in that *maswhaf* which can be regarded as the Qur'an. For example, the Hadith referred to by him is Hadith No. 1 in the section called *Fiihi Dhikrus Swahifa Wal Jafr Wal Jami'a Wamaswhaf Fatimah a.s.* But, then, why did he not also cite Hadith No. 4 which says that what is contained in that *maswhaf* is "an advice to Fatimah a.s."?

It is therefore obvious, from the *ahadith* which are in *al-Kafi*, that the "Maswhaf of Fatimah" does not mean "a copy of the Qur'an" because in it there is neither a single verse of the Qur'an nor any words resembling the words of any verse of the Qur'an. The word *maswhaf* has only been used there to mean "a collection of *suhuf* (an Arabic word meaning *pages*)"; and not the Qur'an at all. Not every *maswhaf* means a Qur'an just as not every *Jami*' means a mosque.

It is my hope that this brief response to the main claims made by Sheikh M. al-Khatib against Shias as far as the Qur'an is concerned, will remove any doubts which my Muslim brothers and sisters might have had on their fellow Muslims, the Shias.

Let us now turn to what is contained in Sunni books which indicate that the Qur'an is not complete, and await to hear what those with similar views as Sheikh M. al-Khatib's have to say because, unfortunately, the Sheikh himself is long dead.

FROM SUNNI SOURCES

1. The first Hadith is the one in *Sahih al-Bukhari*, which we quoted earlier on page 28 of this booklet.
2. The second is the one in *Sahih Muslim*, mentioned herein on page 22.
3. The third is in *Majma'uz Zawaid*, as mentioned on page 21.
4. The fourth is the one in *al-Itqaan*, which concerns the two *suras* as mentioned on page 22.

All the above *ahadith* show that the Qur'an, as we know it today, is either incomplete or something has been added onto it! Apart from them, let us now have a look at the following *ahadith*:

5. In *Sahih al-Bukhari* (Hadith No. 21 on p. 212, Vol. 9) Caliph 'Umar is quoted to have said, "If it were not for the fear that people would say that 'Umar has added (something) in Allah's Book, I would have written the verse on *rajm* with my own hand"!

And in *Sahih Muslim* (Hadith No. 4194 on p. 912, Vol. 3) it is mentioned that the very same 'Umar ibn Khattab said that the verse on *rajm* was "among the verses revealed (to Prophet Muhammad s.a.w.w.)". He then said: "We used to read and memorise and understand the verse."

As for those who do not know the Arabic version of the verse in question, this is it:

ان الشيخ و الشيخة اذا زنيا فارجموهما البتة

which means: “If (when) an old man and an old woman commit adultery, stone them both.”

We have to pose a number of questions here: First, was that a verse from the Qur’an or not? If it was, why did ‘Umar ibn Khattab refrain from writing it down for fear of fellow human beings instead of Allah? Second; why was that verse not included in the Qur’an being used by all Muslims? Third; if it was not a Qur’anic verse, why did ‘Umar wish to write it down in the first place, and then decided against it for the reason given? Fourth, why on earth would he wish to write down a verse which was not from Allah? Lastly, what do such ‘*ahadith* make you think, my dear brother and sister?

6. Again in *Sahih al-Bukhari* (Hadith No. 468 on pages 441–442, Vol. 6) it is mentioned that ‘Alqama used to recite Sura 92:3 differently from either the way we recite it today or the way it appears in our *maswhaf* (copy of the Qur’an). He instead, recited it thus: *Wadh dhakari wal unthaa*. He is then reported to have said: “I bear witness that I heard the Prophet s.a.w.w. reciting it like this. And these (that is, some of the Prophet’s Companions) want me to recite: *Wamaa khalaqadh dhakara wal unthaa*. I swear by Allah! I’ll never follow them.”

Is it not, therefore, clear that according to the above Hadith, the words *wamaa khalaqa*, as they appear in all copies of the Qur'an, have been added on in Sura 92:3? In addition, look how 'Alqama swore that the way he recited it was the same way he used to hear the Prophet s.a.w.w. reciting it, and that he would not abide by the wishes of those other people who wanted him not to recite it the way he did.

It is crucially important at this juncture to note that 'Alqama was not the only one who testified to that fact, but by consulting another Hadith before the one quoted above (Hadith No. 467) one will find Abud Dardaa saying that he also used to hear the Prophet reciting the same verse in a manner similar to that heard by 'Alqama. But Abud Dardaa's testimony was also rejected!

7. In Imam Suyuti's *al-Itqaan Fiy Uluwmil Qur'an* (page 33 of the Second Volume, Fourth Edition, published in 1398H) one finds written therein that Abu Sufyan al-Kal'ai said that one day Muslima ibn Mukhallad al-Ansari said to them: "Tell me about those two verses of the Qur'an *which were not included in the maswhaf!* Nobody responded, although Abdul Kanud Sa'd ibn Malik was present. Therefore Ibn Muslima recited:

ان الذين آمنوا و هاجروا وجاهدوا في سبيل الله باموالهم و انفسهم
الا أبشروا أنتم المفلحون و الّذين آووهم و نصروهم و جادلوا عنهم
قوم الذين غضب الله عليهم أولئك لا تعلم نفس ما اخفي لهم من قرّه
اعين جزاء بما كانوا يعملون

Can anyone find the above verses in the copies of the Holy Qur'an which is in our possession today? Definitely not. The verses closer to those are the ones appearing in Sura

8:72, 9:20 and 32:17. Compare them and see how different they are!

Would Sheikh M. al-Khatib, or those who hold similar views as his, still insist that it is only the Shias who have *ahadith* which mention that the Qur'an is not complete?

Yet More Ahadith

So far we have mentioned only a few of the *ahadith* which deal with the missing of just one or two verses from the Qur'an. Let us now turn to those which concern the omission of large chunks:

8. On page 32 of Volume Two of *al-Itqaan*, it is stated that Lady 'Aisha (the wife of Prophet Muhammad s.a.w.w.) said: "During the days of the Prophet s.a.w.w, *Sura al-Ahzaab* used to be recited in 200 (two hundred) verses. But when 'Uthman collected (the Qur'an) together, we did not get except what it (the *Sura*) is today!"

However, what we have in the copies of the Qur'an today is the *Sura al-Ahzaab* which contains a total of 73 (seventy three) verses. If Sheikh M. al-Khatib and his associates were to be asked about the missing 127 verses, what would their answer be?

9. Again on page 32 of *al-Itqaan* and immediately after the Hadith mentioned above, it is written that Dharr bin Hubaysh was asked by Ubayy bin Ka'b. "How many verses does *Sura al-Ahzaab* have?"

> He answered: “Seventy two or seventy three verses.”
>
> Ubayy remarked: “Although it was like *Sura al-Baqarah* or longer!”

As we all know, *Sura al-Baqarah* has a total of 286 verses. In that case, therefore, where have the rest (that is 213 verses) of *Sura al-Ahzaab* disappeared to? Or how could the missing of the seven verses from *Sura al-Wilaya* in the Qur’an be comparable to the 213 verses of *Sura al-Ahzaab*?

The above mentioned Hadith can also be found in *Muntakhab Kanzil Ummaal*, which is on the margins of *Musnad Ahmad*, Volume Two, page 1.

10. Turning to *Sura Bara’ah* - which, in the Qur’an we read from, consists of 129 verses – we are told that it is like *Sura al-Baqarah* in length which contains 286 verses! (see page 80 of Volume One of *al-Itqaan*). If that is the case, where are the missing 157 verses?

11. Furthermore, on page 34 of Volume Two of *al-Itqaan*, we are told that it has been said by Hudhayfa (in the *al-Mustadrak*) that *Sura Bara’ah,* as is being recited today, is only a quarter of it!

According to that Hadith, therefore, nobody knows where the three quarters (that is 387 verses) are.

The Hadith in question also appears on page 31 of Volume Seven of *Majma'uz Zawaid*, where it is said that its narrators are *thuqaat* (reliable).

12. Apart from all that, according to 'Umar ibn Khattab, number of letters which make the whole Qur'an is 1,027,000 (one million and twenty seven thousand). The same is stated on page 517 of Volume One of *Kanzul Umaal* (Hadith No. 2308). But what is generally known is that the letters in the Qur'an are only a third of the figure quoted! What this means is that twice the number of letters in the Qur'an used by Muslims today is missing. In other words, the Qur'an which 'Umar ibn Khattaab had in mind, is three times bigger than the one we have.

Please compare that *maswhaf* (of Umar) with the one of Fatimah, which Sheikh M. al-Khatib mentioned on page 10 of his book; then have a look at our response on page 28-29 of this booklet. After that ask yourself: Is it the Shias or the Sunnis who have the Qur'an which is three times the size of the one known to all of us?

More Serious Matters

So far we have mentioned the *ahadith* from Sunni sources, which inform us about the missing verses. But, what is more serious, there also are others which deal with the missing verses the number of which nobody knows! For example:

13. In *al-Itqaan* (Volume Two, page 32) it is written that it has been narrated by Naf'i that Ibn 'Umar said: "One of you might say that he has the whole

> Qur'an, but what is it that will make him know what that *whole* (he is talking about) is? The truth is that a large part of the Qur'an has disappeared. But (all) he should say is: "I have taken the part that is manifest."

I advise you, the reader, to please re-read the above narration and think seriously about it. What will appear to one is that Ibn 'Umar used to prevent people from saying that they had the whole Qur'an with them because there was nobody who knew the whole of it. Therefore, according to him, all that one should say is that what one has (of the Qur'an) is what one got! In that case, one is entitled to ask what percentage of it has one missed?

14. What about that part which was eaten by a livestock and could not be retrieved! In *Musnad Ahmad* (Volume Six, page 269), it is written that Lady 'Aisha is quoted to have said that the page which was under her bed was eaten by a livestock, and that this incident took place at the time of the death of the Prophet s.a.w.w. when Lady 'Aisha and others were preoccupied with it.

Therefore, according to that narration, one can assume that the verse on *rajm* and that which talks about the suckling of an adult ten times, were on that page which was eaten up. Several questions here come to one's mind: Where are those verses now? How come that they are not included in the Qur'an which is in our possession? If Lady 'Aisha said that those verses were on that page till the Prophet (s.a.w.w) died, who would have them after his death? And with whose permission?

15. The final point concerns the *maswahif* (copies of the Qur'an) of the Companions of the Prophet s.a.w.w.

On page 10 of his book, Sheikh M. al-Khatib mentioned the *maswhaf* of Fatimah. But it did not occur to him that there were also the *maswahif* of the Companions, whose contents have been mentioned in several Sunni books. The difference is that whereas the contents of the *maswhaf* of Fatimah, as we have seen on page 28-29, are not verses from the Qur'an, all the contents of those of the Companions are. And in them we find verses which are worded differently from those of the Qur'an we currently use! Which ones should we take as authentic – the Companions' or the ones we have?

The readers who understand Arabic should look for a book called *al-Maswahif*, by Abu Dawud; they will see what we are talking about here.

Conclusion

My dear reader, the *ahadith* which we have quoted so far are *only a few* which are in Sunni books. As we have seen, all of them show that the Holy Qur'an is not complete! However, I have not quoted them because I accept them; I definitely don't. Nor can any other Muslim accept them, because they contradict the Qur'an (Sura 15:9 and 41:41-42). I have cited them only to show that just as one can come across such *ahadith* in Shia books, which can be understood to mean that the Qur'an is either incomplete or has some additions, one can do the same in Sunni books. Therefore, if a Sunni feels justified to castigate a Shia for having a Qur'an which is different from the one all

Muslims have, the same will be the case with a Shia against a Sunni – and for the same reason.

What we learn from the above, therefore, is that the Qur’an which Shias believe in is the very one in which Sunnis believe. There is nothing for the two to quarrel about.

In the next book, *inshaa Allah* we shall look at what Shias say about the *ahadith* of Prophet Muhammad s.a.w.w.

ARABIC TERMINOLOGIES

In this booklet there are a number of Arabic terminologies and abbreviations the explanations of which are given hereunder:

aqida	a set of beliefs; theology.
a.s.	*alayhis/ has salaam* (= peace be upon him/ her).
imam	(of a school of thought) a leader.
inshaa Allah	Allah willing.
madhhab	a school of thought.
maswahif	plural of *maswhaf* (see below).
maswhaf	a copy of the Holy Qur'an in Arabic.
mufti	(in Islamic Law) a deliverer of formal legal opinions.
mutawaatir	(of a Hadith) that which has been narrated by such a great number of people that it is impossible for all of them to lie.

raj'ah	belief in the possibility of dead souls returning to earth before the Day of Resurrection.
rajm	(in law) the stoning of an adulterer/ adulteress till he/ she dies.
s.a.w.w.	*sallal Lwaahu alayhi wa aalihii wasallam* (= May peace and blessings of Allah be upon him and his progeny).
sunna	Prophet Muhammad's sayings and practices.
sura	a chapter of the Holy Qur'an.
s.w.t.	subhaanahuu wa ta'alaa (= Glorified and Exalted be He!)
ulamaa	scholars; people learned in Islamic religion.
ummah	the Muslim nation.